

**Eloquence of Milton's Satan  
and its Enthralling, yet Devastating Influence**

[...] but he, his wonted pride  
Soon recollecting, with high words, that bore  
Semblance of worth, not substance, gently raised  
Their fainted courage, and dispelled their fears;  
PL I.527 – 530<sup>1</sup>

Milton's King of Hell<sup>2</sup> is principally admired because of his aptitude of expressiveness<sup>3</sup> – “Satan has no less than five long soliloquies, almost as many as Hamlet” (Gardner 1965:31) – allowing him to be seen as an outstanding orator whose exceptional techniques of presenting dire facts as the good ones and prevaricating; exercising flattery, hypocrisy and falsehoods are tokens of his steadfastness in seducing and eventually morally annihilating the first people. Furthermore, his oratory makes him be perceived as he really is inside – the magniloquent fallen archangel torn, both inwardly and outwardly, with pride-ridden hatred, revenge and envy, yet enthusiastically exerting the prevailing sway upon other characters in the universe of the epic. He is the depraved one whose inner existence is depicted by the descriptive language that Milton formulates for that purpose. God of this World demonstrates his excellent capacity from the very inception; what is more, he is absolutely aware of its value and necessity for his malevolent existence, thereby allowing him to unearth his genuine personality of wickedness incarnate, partially on account of deliberate application of positive features to ignoble ends. For that reason, he is first of all heard and only then seen as Monarch of Hell. It is his indispensable weapon against the setbacks he suffers along his path of development as demons' Emperor whilst being in the throes of predicament stigmatizing his agonizing path of consequences of rebellion. Thus, in order to alleviate the excruciating

---

<sup>1</sup> All quotes referring to John Milton's epic *Paradise Lost* are taken from Edinburgh: Penguin Popular Classics. The Roman numeral refers to the number of the Book, whereas the Arabic one signifies the number of the verse. The abbreviation PL stands for *Paradise Lost*

<sup>2</sup> Appellations play the fundamental part in the epic. They are virtually brimming with Satan's 'aliases'. The reader can get to know him under such titles as “Arch-Enemy,” (I.81) “Foe,” (122) “Chief,” (567) “Commander,” (589) “Emperor,” (II.510) “Traitor,” (689) “Adversary,” (III.81) “Tempter,” (IV.10) “Fiend,” (166) “Devil,” (502) “the grisly King,” (821) “revolted Spirit,” (835) “the Prince of Hell,” (871) to name only a few.

<sup>3</sup> The given article upon Satan's influential rhetoric was incorporated into the author's doctoral dissertation entitled *The Archetype of Evil Genius – John Milton, Joseph Conrad, Fyodor Dostoevsky*.

burden he deploys rhetoric overflowing with emotional touches and he even drives at fallen angels' wounded ambition by ironically implying their vile condition wishing to revive those who have become deprived of all hope and are plunged into an ultimate anguish, grudgingly taking the unavoidable consequence of both defiance and obliteration of relations established in the Great Chain of Being.

Fiend's rhetoric is brimming with lofty expressions which can effortlessly be summarized in the statement: I, functioning in your new world as the unshakeable point of reference, am your lord who helped you reject God's servitude and I, and only I, shall bring you authentic freedom and bliss. The victorious shout "me preferring" (PL I.102) resounds the infernal dome convincingly confirming and legitimizing Foe's action. As Daiches has put it, "the style often known as 'Miltonic' is, it is hardly an exaggeration to say, the high Satanic style of perverted rhetoric which led so many romantic critics to acclaim Satan as a hero" (1971:9). The harangue does plant the seed and Beelzebub's first oration is devoted to the acclamation of his master, the guarantor of security and order in their new abode. He extols not only Satan's position as a leader who appears to be capable of releasing them from dire straits but also presents him (he accomplishes his acclaim as an excellent lawyer) as a supreme warrior who fights for the good cause. According to Edward Dowden, "Satan's best hopes are founded on the liability of a heroic leader" (qtd. in Muldrow 1970:124). Second-best eulogizes Satan in such a manner:

'O Prince, O Chief of many throned Powers  
That led th' embattled Seraphim to war  
Unde thy conduct, and, in dreadful deeds  
Fearless, endangered Heaven's perpetual King,  
And put to proof his high supremacy,  
Whether upheld by strength, or chance, or fate!

PL I.128 – 133

Accordingly, owing to deployment of flattering epithets, the speech could be treated as the voice of the fallen crew's trepidation as to their future in Hell. Beelzebub knows that in such inhospitable surroundings it is indispensable to praise the one deemed the strongest both to deplore him for protection and to place the burden of responsibility for further action solely upon him. Subsequently, the reader is bombarded with sublime expressions concerning Satan's position as an intrepid redeemer of fallen angels: "Leader of those armies bright / Which, but th' Omnipotent, none could have foiled'," (272 – 273) "great Commander" (358) and "their great Sultan," (348) to count only a few. Although the status of Satan appears to be

unshakable and his resolve so unflinching, being in truth the legitimate instigator of iniquity permeating the matrix of relations in Hell, Fish points to the simple fact that Foe's "apparent heroism is discredited by covert allusions to other heroes in other epics, by his ignoble accommodation to the 'family' he meets at the gates of Hell, by his later discoveries squatting at the ear of Eve in the form of a toad" (1971:344). Despite the disguise of intrepidity, he proves to be a fake who experiences trepidation as to such a trifle as his subjects' judgment upon him.

He dexterously uses magniloquence both as an excellent speaker and a legitimate sovereign of Hell as well, allowing the reader to perceive him in terms of Ricoeur's conceptions upon the figure of the embodied subject that is primarily an expressive subject displaying in that way his twisted personality. Addison expresses the eulogy of Satan with the accent on his proclivity for oratory in such a manner:

The Thoughts in the first Speech and Description of *Satan*, who is one of the principal Actors, in this Poem, are wonderfully proper to give us a full idea of him. His Pride, Envy and Revenge, Obstinacy, Despair and Impenitence, are all of them very artfully interwoven. In short, his first Speech is a Complication of all those Passions which discover themselves separately in several other of his Speeches in the Poem. The whole Part of this great Enemy of Mankind is filled with such Incidents as are very apt to raise and terrify the Reader's Imagination

1970:170

Milton's Prince of Hell almost always commences the conversation<sup>4</sup> and is all agog to achieve, whatever the potential cost, the objectives he has decided to satisfy. As an insightful politician, he appears to be capable of attaining anything he conjures up with the use of his mesmerizing skill.

Thus although the most concentrated bustle connected with his brave words and the influence they exert is detected in the first three Books of *Paradise Lost*, other subsections of the epic are likewise dotted with his daring harangue and tirades. "One begins by simultaneously admitting the effectiveness of Satan's rhetoric and discounting it because it *is* Satan's, but at some point a reader trained to analyse as he reads will allow admiration for a technical skill to push aside the imperative of Christian watchfulness," (1971:12) notes Fish. In Book I, Satan's speeches denote his sounding of both the new surroundings and infernal crew's situation after the collapse but they are also a prologue to a synod of demons sitting in the Pandemonium. Next, Book II sets the infernal debate during which the key decisions as to

---

<sup>4</sup> There are only a very few moments in *Paradise Lost* during which Satan does not initiate the conversation. One of them occurs during the ambush made up by angels on Fiend disguised as a toad sitting at slumbering Eve and creating realistic dreams in her mind. See PL IV.823 – 843.

their future are diligently discussed and taken. Finally, Book IX delineates the moment of a seductive temptation during which the archetype of evil genius is shown as being on the highest level of intensity of his capacity.

“‘Sleep’st thou, companion dear? what sleep can close / Thy eyelids? and rememberest what decree / Of yesterday, so late hath passed the lips / Of Heaven’s Almighty?’” (PL V.673 – 676) – this question, delivered by Lucifer to his second best, Beelzebub, denotes his disagreement with the status quo since Jesus, who according to his wishful thinking is his equal, has just been elevated and enthroned his Lord.<sup>5</sup> In truth, he rebels against being ousted from the principal flank of power and influence in the Empyrean. Seen in that light, Fiend is perceived as the individual who is aware of the fact that the power is in unison. The similar conversation, which occurs after the heinous expulsion from Heaven and in which the same rebels participate is, in fact, the first one in the narrative order of the epic. Satan chastises his co-partner for the lack of activity. “If thou beest he-but oh, how fallen! how changed / From him who, in the happy realms of light, / Clothed with transcendent brightness, didst outshine / Myriads, though bright! [...] In equal ruin” (I.84 – 87, 91). Both chronologically and narratively in the epic, Adversary is characterized as an eloquent figure who does not hesitate to share his thoughts with the one whom he trusts. Psychologically, speeches appear to act as a process of fleeing from his due in the commotion, thereby presenting him in terms of a neurotic character that invariably carries with him the privation that constitutes his contemptible state of mind. Foe’s hectic activity, commented as pretending – “so well he feigned” (III.639) – is only an abortive, in the long run, escape from Hell-within.

### **Intrepid Impostor – Falsehoods and Self-Deception**

Artificer of fraud, and was the first  
That practised falsehood under saintly show  
PL IV.121 – 122

Margarita Stocker holds that “God’s counterpart is Satan the ‘Author of all ill’, false plotter, hypocrite and thus false speaker, of ‘glozing lies’” (1988:71) effortlessly assuming the

---

<sup>5</sup> Lucifer – Beelzebub cooperation is full of imagery that indicates their profound involvement into revolt against their Creator and those values that are characteristic of His reign in the Empyrean and it is advisory to add that it is not the only one that the reader can come across in the literary domain. The Roman Catholic Bible is also a prolific source of examples of such pernicious symbiotic enterprises. The Book of Judith, chapter II depicts cooperation focused entirely upon infliction of evil and destruction between the king of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar II (630 – 562 B.C.) and the Assyrian general of his forces, Holofernes. They both debate how to initiate the annihilation of the whole world.

role of a master of disguise acting as a magnificent rhetorician. As the literary materialization of iniquity follower, Satan does reveal an irresistible proclivity for shadowing the truth by bringing to fore only those elements which his speakers wish, subliminally or not, to hear. Moreover, Fiend tends to present thorny events as something which has beforehand been planned or at least foretold by him and over which he exerts an absolute control. Demons' Commander laconically delineates a disastrous expulsion from the Empyrean and their ensuing situation as a glorious enterprise that is not accomplished yet and, by doing so he falls into a romantic deception that, apart from other facets of his verbalism, signifies an unvarying search for his subjectivity. At the onset of Book I the Arch-Fiend poses the problematic and tricky question – “What though the field be lost?” (105) – which he, in due course, answers himself in his address to the assembly of the army of the wicked: “All is not lost,” (106) the demonstration reiterated later on in the pronouncement: “I give not Heaven for lost” (II.14).

The certain question is constructed in such a manner that its context forces the reader to distinguish it as a delicate one and the reader is at a loss whether Satan is so overwhelmingly high and mighty that he does not recognize the simple fact that the Omnipotent cannot be traumatized and defeated or in order not to lose his face in front of the crew he instantaneously invents his own version of events with a profound belief in future implementation of whatever he utters. It is quite feasible that the archetype of evil genius embraces those two alternatives concurrently. Nevertheless, whatever the reason, the reader hears Satan vehemently claiming that “Here,” in Hell, “at least / We shall be free” (I.258 – 259). Once more he blurs the gravity of his appalling condition into which he has been grudgingly hurled down, and he attributes Hell, a physical and limited spatial entity conducive towards feeling of “bottomless perdition [...] / In adamant chains and penal fire,” (47 – 48) with a sense of self-sufficiency.

Unquestionably, Revolted Spirit is deliberately erroneous as to their alleged power enabling them to return flourishingly from the abhorred deep to the bliss of their previous abode. Although the lesson seems to be completed, Satan is still eager to boast of his total supremacy, the approach appears to be a complete fake allowing him to cover his trepidation of being found impotent to carry the burden of the exigencies. The pompous attitude is certainly enhanced by an authoritative diatribe to his fallen squad; a tirade akin to techniques made by politicians promising implausible things. Even though the reader is likely to find the element of bravado in Foe's rhetoric, one is certain that when “pressed logically, Satan involves himself in innumerable contradictions [...] the very revolt and fall is an enormous contradiction and absurdity in itself” (Werblowsky 1952:7). Fiend asserts that:

Fallen Cherub, to be weak is miserable,  
Doing or suffering – but of this be sure:  
To do aught good never will be our task,  
But ever to do ill our sole delight,  
As being the contrary to his high will  
Whom we resist.

PL I.157 – 162

With such dreadful words the scheme of revenge on God commences. Hellish Commander speaks as if he were an exceptional general – “the 17<sup>th</sup> century thought of angels as male and military,” (1972:62) adds Broadbent. It is widely held that by reason of Fiend’s bravery or rather lack of common sense, the prospect of vengeance is hatched in this infernally supercilious evil genius and immediately discussed during the diabolical debate.<sup>6</sup>

Fallen crew’s self-deception, so abundantly revealed during the hellish gathering in Pandemonium, involves also the presupposition that den of sorrow, a spatially limited dungeon, can really become the place to which stern conditions demons can become inured to and where, despite devastating alienation and excruciating silence, they can reign without restraint feeling ubiquitous delight denoting alleged freedom from tyranny and permanent surveillance of God. “Here we may reign secure, and, in my choice, / To reign is worth ambition, though in Hell: / Better to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven,” (PL I.261 – 263) shouts furious and proud Fiend. Although Satan promises his horde a collective reign by

---

<sup>6</sup> Only the key figures in terms of hierarchy participate in the dispute. “My sentence is for open war. Of wiles, / More unexpert, I boast not” (PL II.51 – 52) avers Moloch, blinded by infernal hatred that he is unable to perceive the simple truth that there are heavy odds against their ‘fighting back’. The next suggestion is made by Belial, who claims that he “should be much for open war” (119) but after having suffered the consequences of the terrible expulsion from the Empyrean, the fallen angel is aware of God’s power and knows that even if

[...] all Hell should rise  
With blackest insurrection [...]  
[...] our great Enemy,  
All incorruptible, would on his throne  
Sit unpolluted,

135 – 139

The last words, however, belong to Satan himself who behaves here as a genuine leader. Furthermore, Fiend’s fallacious assumption – “our grand Foe, / Who now triumphs, and in the excess of joy / Sole reigning holds the tyranny of Heaven” (I.122 – 124) – is partially echoed in Moloch’s speech to an assembly of demons. He immodestly avers that God, after their heinous and inequitable expulsion to the “dark opprobrious den of shame” and the “prison of his tyranny,” “reigns / By our delay” (II.58 – 60). What is more, Moloch is so conceited that he eagerly juxtaposes the possibility of victorious return to Heaven with the sense of effortlessness: “The ascent is easy,” (81) he concludes falling into some kind of mental vacuity.

While analysing Satan’s supreme eloquence Grossman accentuates that the “narrative of repetition that characterizes Satan is dramatically enacted in the devil’s consult when each speaker elaborates a position already discussed privately by Satan and Beelzebub. Each infernal leader expresses, in his own fashion, Satan’s thought, because each repeats, in less complete form, the thought pattern that define the fallen subject” (1987:42).

using the pronoun ‘we,’ ironically enough, ascendancy shall be seized by Satan alone – the Father of lies effortlessly presents such a vision to his flabbergasted demons – as the pronoun ‘my’ along with the noun ‘choice’ clearly indicates. Hence, similarly to other verbal outbursts, the design of reigning in Hell and ultimate return to the Empyrean is undoubtedly reinforced with the strong accent on “union, and firm faith, and firm accord,” (II.36) allowing them to “claim [...] just inheritance of old” (38). Naturally, the fallen band is so unconditionally at the mercy of their Monarch, functioning for them as the archetype, and the best point of reference, of their conduct replete with iniquity and negation, that they are enchanted to believe in whatever falsehood he utters. Hence, as the most prominent follower of an immoral path, Foe is the instigator of an unceasing flow of falsehoods that are copied by his co-partners.

### **Harbinger of Moral Death – Cunning and Rationalizing**

[...] I see thy fall  
Determined, and thy hapless crew involved  
In this perfidious fraud, contagion spread  
Both thy crime and punishment

PL V.878 – 881

Cunning and rationalizing, both deployed in profusion throughout his expedition, appear to exert the powerful sway upon other characters, persistently treated by him in a supercilious manner by being abused in many ways. As the archetype evil genius enduring psychological lack and neurosis pushing him towards wickedness, Foe cannot exist without that skill; he repeatedly applies all the positive features of his personality to negative ends.

Infernal Fiend, the character endowed with supreme intelligence, knows in his heart of hearts that in view of yawning chasm between him and the Omnipotent, he can only avail himself of sneakiness. There is not any other, let alone better option for the insubordinate imp than an existence saturated with constant conniving that camouflages emotions of despair, and apprehension endured by Foe that, seen in that light, is the perfect example of Bakhtin’s concept of a subject who, gradually, becomes answerable for one’s deeds. Although he boasts of his apparent capability of initiating an everlasting and open war with God, step by step, he opts for furtive scheming to maintain his aspiration; the desire which can be summarized in a harangue delivered to flabbergasted demons:

If then his providence

Out of our evil seek to bring forth good,  
Our labour must be to pervert that end,  
And out of good still to find means of evil

PL I.162 – 165

He incessantly shows off in front of his hellish family, but, this state of ‘wishful thinking of ever-lasting power’ lasts only up to the end of Book I, undergoes a gradual change and is finally transmogrified with Satan’s question – “What if we find / Some easier enterprise?” (II.344 – 345). Yet, even though the tone of speech fluctuates from audaciousness to scheming full of veiled fearfulness, the infernal horde resolves not to stay calm in Hell but wishes to conduct attack, assuming an utterly different approach. Satan declares:

All things invite  
To peaceful counsels, and the settled state  
Of order, how in safety best we may  
Compose our present evils, with regard  
Of what we are and where, dismissing quite  
All thoughts of war. Ye have what I advise

278 – 283

The course of action is directed forthrightly towards Adam and Eve for their position as fallen angels’ substitutes in God’s universe – Burden acclaims that in “the characteristic way of his ideology Satan is, in the Garden, taking a chance, running his luck” (1967:93) – and indirectly towards unshakeable God for Son’s elevation and his hurling down into Hell. Yet, apart from affecting moral iniquity, Satan’s cunning includes bringing spiritual death as well. The narrator notes that Foe, after landing, ironically enough, on the Tree of Life in Eden, “sat devising death / To them who lived” (PL IV.197 – 198).

Moral demise, as an objective and outcome of his endeavour, does not appear from anywhere in an impeccable surrounding of Garden. As an exceptionally intelligent archetype of iniquitous character, Foe gleans his knowledge upon the possibility of moral collapse from unaware Adam and Eve, whom he, with evident satisfaction, wishes to shove into a fallen state with the use of rationalising; the aptitude he has artfully mastered in the lair crammed with depraved angles engrossed in “wandering mazes lost / Of good and evil” (II.561 – 562).<sup>7</sup> Saurat asserts that Satan’s endeavour is “the cause of the human drama. The scheme is simple, clear and grand” (qtd. in Tillyard 1946:242). As evil incarnate, the hellish Emperor is the

---

<sup>7</sup> Fiend’s demons are graphically displayed as being engaged in discourses of “good and evil [...] / Of happiness and final misery, / Passion and apathy, and glory and shame- / Vain wisdom all, and false philosophy!” (PL II.562 – 565).



pitiless death-bringer who blemishes with malicious delight anything that is innocent and spotless. His involvement in the ghastly procedure allows Sin and Death,<sup>8</sup> whose horrid shapes have awe-inspiring force, to enter the world – the activity graphically visualized in the painstaking process of constructing pavement stretching from Hell up to the world – and infuses physical death to those who are alive.

Aside from scheming, the fallen Archangel is absorbed in idle rationalizing as well, perceived as searching for his genuine subjectivity.<sup>9</sup> Being one of the rhetorical devices it is fiercely scoffed by Abdiel, the faithful servant of the Omnipotent, who does not waste the oncoming possibility of showing his allegiance to God during a verbal controversy with Satan. The staunch angel, not showing any trepidation in face of the entire hellish horde, boldly refers to Fiend's proclivity for false rationalizing: "'Apostate! still thou err'st, nor end wilt find / Of erring, from the path of truth remote. / Unjustly thou deprav'st it with the name / Of servitude, to serve whom God ordains, / Or Nature'" (PL VI.172 – 176). In truth, many a time the narrative voice warns that there is invariably the possibility of plunging into temptation of transforming true wisdom and knowledge, having its roots in genuine comprehension and acceptance of one's place at the Great Chain of Being, into mazy thinking, stigmatized with mutiny against that place, assuming the shape of the irresistible urge to be more significant.

### **Seductive Deceiver – Hypocrisy, Flattery, and Temptation**

For Man will hearken to his glozing lies

---

<sup>8</sup> His affinity with Death, his son, is brought to the reader's vision in Book II where he, as a daring explorer and fugitive from the fire eternal, encounters his closest family at the gates of Hell. See verses 648 – 884. While pointing to Satan's infernal family, Le Comte emphasizes the fact that, in truth, "Satan, Sin and Death are a parody of the Holy Trinity. Satan has volunteered for man's destruction, as Christ, in Book III, will volunteer for man's salvation" (1978:75).

<sup>9</sup> In Milton's moral universe, idle rationalizing is accentuated by Satan himself as the last chance to which he and his horrid copartners are forced to abide. While delineating their accurate situation, Infernal King complains that:

Thus repulsed, our final hope  
Is flat despair: we must exasperate  
Th' Almighty Victor to spend all his rage;  
And that must end us; that must be our cure-  
To be no more; sad cure; for who would lose,  
Though full of pain, this intellectual being,  
Those thoughts that wander through eternity,  
To perish rather, swallowed up and lost  
In the wide womb of uncreated Night,  
Devoid of sense and motion?

PL II.142 – 151

As the narrative unfolds, the reader perceives Satan's proclivity for hypocrisy during an encounter with the "Archangel Uriel, one of the seven / Who in God's presence, nearest to his throne, / Stand ready at command, and are his eyes / That run through all the Heavens" (PL III.648 – 651) when Fiend changes his deformed shape with the purpose of taking on the appearance of one of inferior angels, he thus "effortlessly assumes the form of the bogus dissembler" (Giza, "Sublimely Gifted" 2009:178). Foe is cognizant of the fact that only after having changed his outward form is he able to accomplish his mission since the infamy of his revolt – unavoidably functioning as the prototype of other forms of insurgencies undertaken by those who wish to adhere to his manner of conduct – is spreading exceptionally fast in Miltonian moral universe. Owing to a masterful method of amalgamating hypocrisy, discernible neither by the man nor angels, with camouflage, Uriel, Regent of the Sun, is effortlessly conned. He is deceived but his "failure is excusable, because he is by nature incapable of piercing Satan's disguise; in fact, his virtue works to maximize the probability of his deception," (1971:233) notes Fish. Satan disingenuously pays homage to Uriel and bowing low carries on his scheme of revenge.

Upon leaving for Paradise, Infernal Hypocrite takes advantage of an opportunity of revealing his sharp tongue whilst being entangled in a verbal controversy with two angels, Ithuriel and Zephon, who have been sent by Gabriel to seize a spying Fiend. In truth, after victory over Uriel – who eventually makes up for his oversight and with a sharper attention descries an abnormal behaviour marked with "passions foul obscured" (PL IV.571) – Enemy of God reveals an impossibility of staying in order and, by doing so, discloses his unadulterated identity of a duplicitous creature. Belsey holds that:

The body of Satan also speaks, and we see the hypocrisy it betrays. Disguised as a cherub in order to execute his revenge unperceived, Satan, the narrative voice reminds us, is not what he seems. He is inauthentic and, from a humanist standpoint, correspondingly unheroic. Insincerity, the betrayal of the self, is the supreme humanist sin

1988:92

What is of significance here is his landing on the mountain that is located in the northern section of the Garden of Eden, the place partially reminiscent of that northern region in the Empyrean from which rebellion has been launched. The broad perspective on his invective mixed with offended ambition is unfolded in Book IV where Satan conceitedly answers messengers back: "If I must contend," said he, / 'Best with the best, the sender, not the sent, /

Or all at once: more glory will be won, / Or less be lost” (851 – 854). This is the paradigm of pride and hypocrisy incarnate whose chief objective for this moment is temptation of Adam and Eve, dwellers of Paradise.

Undoubtedly, it is something looming in the narrative from the beginning up to the last sections of the epic. It does permeate Milton’s universe with an overwhelming, yet extremely subtle, power. In truth, although seduction reveals its ruinous force in Book IX, the epic voice refers to Satan, in the first invocation, as being the “infernal Serpent; he it was whose guile, / Stirred up with envy and revenge, deceived / The mother of mankind,” (I.34 – 36) as the impeccable archetype of treachery. Milton evidently differentiates between Satan’s commanding addresses to his angels initiating the blasphemous war and raising their spirit after the Fall, and temptation per se executed on the first parents. Burden accentuates that “Milton rightly treats the occasion as a public debate, not as a temptation” (1967:38). It is as if it were a public lecture; the preliminary phase leading to the lure as the acme of Satan’s oratory.

The initial thought of seduction as an imperative component in the scheme of malice is being premeditated during the infernal synod by Beelzebub who found searching for the best solution out of the complicated position echoes Satan’s prediction – “Space may produce new Worlds” where God “Intended to create [...] / A generation whom his choice regard [...] / [...] the Sons of Heaven” therefore “[...] to pry, shall be perhaps / Our first eruption” (PL I.650, 652 – 656) – to disturb unwavering God by means of moral obliteration of his last creatures, Adam and Eve. The evil incarnate reveals an irresistible craving for passing the overflowing amount of wickedness to those who are, according to his morbid philosophy, more esteemed and loved by their Creator. This proposal is conducive towards the assumption that Satan is likely to possess the ability of prophesizing. Beelzebub’s suggestion, however, develops Satan’s concept a little further and he, after having reiterated the possibility of creation of “another World, the happy seat / Of some new race, called Man,” (II.347 – 348) advocates the proposal of a meticulous inspection both of the locus and those new creatures. The examination may allow them to find out what their power and weaknesses are; they finally conjure up the best method of action – subtle cunning as the most appropriate method of multiplication of iniquity. The course of action, apparently, is chosen by Satan alone who praises his co-partners for the shrewd thought and immediately commences his solitary and thorny mission, heading his steps for Eden.

As an excellent warrior and archetypical hero attributed with proclivity for malevolence, Fiend does reveal an exceptional intelligence while preparing for seduction. He

scrutinizes the garden diligently so as to find the vessel proper for the act; he directs his heavy brow at the snake, the brute which can devotedly serve his revolting wiles in the most appropriate way – “The Serpent subtlest beast of all the field” (IX.86). He does that on account of his being absolutely cognizant of the fact that the success of temptation depends largely on this move. “The legacy of Satan will be a perversion of natural goods, an inheritance of illusion, of ‘show’ and ‘appearance’” (Giamatti 1999:333). He knows that the deformed image of the fallen angel, some of whom, in their full celestial glory, Adam and Eve have frequently seen and welcomed in their dwelling of bliss, could unquestionably make Eve become apprehensive and the enterprise could be doomed to abject failure. Furthermore, in serpent’s disguise – indicating his inclination for assuming a wealth of various masks – he has much time to prepare the act of destruction, since “for in the wily snake, / Whatever sleights, none would suspicious mark” (PL IX.91 – 92). In such apparel Satan is ready for the attack and commences with only one thought, the one besmeared with rancour, revenge and envy. He wishes: “I seek, but others to make such / As I [...] / For only in destroying I find ease / To my relentless thoughts” (127 – 130). Nothing in Miltonian universe can stop him at that moment. He has overcome many an obstacle in order to appear in Eden so his pride inflates and compels him to frenetic activity. Initially, seduction appears to be an uncomplicated menace due to Eve’s firm belief in her steadfastness in not succumbing to any form of temptation: “a foe / May tempt it, I expected not to hear,” (280 – 281) but, its concluding outcome is the expulsion from Eden on account of which, hopefully for fallen Adam and Eve, they “stand an opportunity to find paradise, far happier, within themselves” (Giza, “The Concept” 2009:36).

Milton makes it apparent that the process of seduction is marked with two distinctive timelines. The beginning of the act is graphically visualized in the moment Eve, after many a deploring lamentation on the side of Adam, resolves to leave him under the pretence of sharing chores; the move which is only her whim of indulging herself in a feeling of freedom from surveillance of over-caring Adam.<sup>10</sup> She forcefully determines to go away: “Thus

---

<sup>10</sup> It is worthwhile incorporating here Burden’s assumption that the “first important episode in Book IX is the separation of Adam and Eve. Genesis does not say whether Eve was alone or not when she was talking with the serpent but most of the commentators argued, logically enough, that she was, since the speciousness of the serpent’s arguments would have been immediately apparent to Adam” (1967:80). Yet, digressing a little from the concept of Adam’s presence or absence at the moment of Eve’s surrender to charms of Satan’s temptation, it is of significance to accentuate the fact that Milton’s depiction of Eve as the weaker vessel by means of whom sinfulness, mayhem, and iniquity emerge in the existence of the first people is embedded in the broader discourse prevalent in Renaissance. In line with this discourse, a woman, perceived as “a tool of seduction and ensnarement,” (Poniatowska 2003:38) is a creature endowed, primarily, with sensuality and due to this psychomoral constitution, she is “subject to instincts and impulses,” (41) rather than to brainpower. Hence, the body of a woman emerges as “the figure of transgression and decay” (43) bringing moral disease to the man.

saying, from her husband's hand her hand / Soft she withdrew, and, like [...] of Delia's train / Betook her to the groves" (PL IX.385 – 358). In the throes of severance from her husband, the idea of withdrawing her hand seems to be of considerable significance – it defends the thesis that it is her own concept to behave in such an irresponsible way. In the consequence, infernal temptation commences for good. The ending, though, is marked with the moment Eve devours the forbidden fruit which she, in turn, offers to her husband.

Bold Satan in serpent arrives at the conclusion that the success of seduction depends principally on taking Eve, hopefully for him being severed from Adam, by storm; the element of showing-off appears to be thus indispensable. To say that Fiend is a performer is far from being accurate – in fact, he is an over-hyped comedian nimbly committing deeds which fluently negate the laws of nature and even gravitation so as to impress wandering and wondering Mother of mankind:<sup>11</sup>

So spake the Enemy of Mankind, enclosed  
In serpent, inmate bad, and toward Eve  
Addressed his way; not with indented wave,  
Prone on the ground, as since, but on his rear,  
Circular base of rising folds, that towered  
Fold above fold, a surging maze; his head  
Crested aloft, and carbuncle his eyes;  
With burnished neck of verdant gold, erect  
Amidst his circling spires, that on the grass  
Floated redundant.

PL IX.494 – 503

Although it is accurate that Milton refers to the process of seduction as being fraudulent temptation, it is beyond any doubt that it is exceedingly flattering for Eve. Being in fact an outstanding strategist Satan does commence the act very tenderly in order not to make Eve become apprehensive which could indubitably have a disastrous effect upon an entire diabolical enterprise. First of all, he praises her as if she were a queen – which is, in fact, true on account of the undeniable fact that she is Adam's beloved (the first man as the 'king' is presented with "spirit, reason, knowledge, ability to speak, land where he can live" (Giza,

---

<sup>11</sup> Satan, so it seems, acts in his bravado in a similar manner to a male animal that is doing whatever it might so as to allure the female. Like instinct pushes brutes to behave in a certain way to initiate the process of copulation and race preservation, Satan, too, indulges in flattery-temptation dance so as to 'impregnate' Eve with sin of disobedience. He dances, prances, shows off and flatters, but, despite his susceptibility to positive emotions he even falls victim to charms of the first woman – "In the last soliloquy before approaching Eve he recites again his lesson that destruction is his only joy and grieves again over the weakness he feels" (Stein 1977:83) – and when Eve, in consequence, submits to his charms, Satan attacks and delivers a mortal blow – the impregnation with transgression of God's behest.

“The Concept” 2009:31) and a helper, a woman<sup>12</sup>) – but Tempter does that in such a way that she becomes cognizant of this prerogative for the first time in her blissful existence: “So glozed the Tempter, and his proem tuned. / Into the heart of Eve his words made way,” (PL IX.549 – 550) bemoans the epic voice. Being reassured with the first tangible success, Satan inflates Eve with pride, which swiftly grows and eventually explodes as a colossal balloon the moment she plucks the fruit. “The tempter does, to some extent, give her a sense of rights withheld, he does appeal to her self-admiring spirit, to some extent he does, perhaps, awake in her a sense of injured merit,” (1947:38) claims Waldock. Foe does that by deftly referring to her not only as a resemblance of God, but also as a “‘Empress of this fair World, resplendent Eve!’” (PL IX.568) and “declared / Sovran of creatures, universal Dame!” (611 – 612). Such an adulation hems in Eve utterly (making her perform as though she were utterly spellbound) and results in her asking Satan for a way to that wonderful tree, the request so fervidly desired by Foe. She betakes herself towards destruction, and at this very moment, as it is graphically hinted by Stocker, Eve and later on Adam “are already demonstrably in the power of Satan, a power they have themselves conferred upon him by accepting as truth his ‘glozing lies’” (1988:74). The archetype of evil genius, remarkably prominent and charismatic subject replete with psychologically wounded aspirations, accomplishes his innermost desires of splitting his detestable burden, emerging in fact as his most distinguishing attribute.

---

<sup>12</sup> While analysing the concept of sexes and their roles, Uliński emphasizes the fact that “Eve is created for Adam, primarily, for him not to be alone, and secondly, as a suitable help. Creation out of Adam’s rib signifies their closeness, facilitating the process of their becoming ‘one flesh’. Many a time philosophers have pondered upon the genuine function of Eve’s help. Augustine [...] believes that it is indubitably associated with procreation” (2001:59).

## REFERENCES

- Addison, Joseph.** "Addison's papers on *Paradise Lost*." in *Milton – the Critical Heritage*, ed. John T., Shawcross. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970. pp. 147 – 220.
- Belsey, Catherine.** *John Milton: Language, Gender, Power*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
- Broadbent, John.** *Paradise Lost – Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Burden, H. Denis.** *The Logical Epic: A Study of the Argument of Paradise Lost*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.
- Daiches, David.** *Milton*. London: Hutchinson University Library, 1971.
- Fish, E. Stanley.** *Surprised by Sin: The Reader in Paradise Lost*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.
- Gardner, Helen.** *The Reading of Paradise Lost*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Giamatti, A. Bartlett.** *The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Giza, Jarosław.** "Sublimely Gifted but Destined to Fall: A Comparative Study of Conrad's Kurtz and Milton's Satan as the Archetype of Evil Genius." in *Joseph Conrad: Between Literary Techniques and Their Messages*, ed. Wiesław Krajka. Boulder – Lublin – New York: East Europeans Monographs – Maria Curie-Skłodowska University – Columbia University Press, 2009, pp. 173 – 190; *Conrad: Eastern and Western Perspectives*, ed. Wiesław Krajka, vol. 18.
- . "The Concept of Sexuality and Procreation in the Holy Matrimony Delineated in Milton's 'Paradise Lost' as against 17<sup>th</sup> century Mores." in *Języki Obce – Teoria i Praktyka*, eds. Grzegorz Jaśkiewicz and Krzysztof Nycz. Nowy Sącz: Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa w Nowym Sączu, 2009, pp. 29 – 42; *Neophilologica Sandeciensia*, ed. Zdzisława Załona, vol. 4.
- Grossman, Marshall.** *Authors to Themselves: Milton and the Revelations of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Le Comte, Edward.** *Milton and Sex*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.
- Milton, John.** *Paradise Lost*. 1667. Edinburgh: Penguin Popular Classics, 1996.
- Muldrow, M. George.** *Milton and the Drama of the Soul: a Study of the Theme of the Restoration of Men in Milton's Later Poetry*. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.

- Poniatowska, Patrycja.** "Fragmentyzacja ciała kobiecego w komedii satyrycznej Bena Jonsona." in *Anglistyka wrocławska wczoraj i dziś*, ed. Anna Michońska-Stadnik. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2003, pp. 37 – 45; *Anglica Wratislaviensia*, ed. Anna Michońska-Stadnik, vol. 40.
- Stein, Arnold.** *The Art of Presence: The Poet and Paradise Lost*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.
- Stocker, Margarita.** *Paradise Lost: An Introduction to the Variety of Criticism*. London: Macmillan, 1988.
- Tillyard, M. W. Eustace.** *Milton*. London: Chatto und Windus, 1946.
- Uliński, Maciej.** *Kobieta i mężczyzna: Dzieje refleksji filozoficzno-społecznej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Aureus, 2001.
- Waldock, A. J.** *Paradise Lost and its Critics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947.
- Werblowsky, Zwi.** *Lucifer and Prometheus: A Study of Milton's Satan*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited, 1952.